

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Overall Rating **4**

Ratings Summary

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Population Growth		14%
Age and Condition	3	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	4	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		N/A

Non-Evaluative Comments

None.

Project Summary

<i>Applicant:</i>	San Francisco, City & County of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	San Francisco Public Library
<i>Project Type/Priority</i>	Renovation & Expansion of Existing Library/2
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	13,820
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$5,958,841

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

RATING

3

Age Rating

4 = No Existing Facility
 4 = 1949 or older
 3 = 1950-1959
 2 = 1960-1964
 1 = 1965-1974
 0 = 1975-2003

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4

Structural Renovation Rating

4 = No Renovation
 4 = 1954 & earlier
 3 = 1955-1962
 2 = 1963-1972
 1 = 1973-1978
 0 = 1979-2003

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4

4 = Extremely Poor Condition
 3 = Poor condition
 2 = Acceptable condition
 1 = Good condition
 0 = Very good condition

Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	2	3
3	2	2
4	3	3
4	3	4
3	2	2
4	3	3
3	3	4
3	3	2

Rating Scale for element 9

4 = Extremely Poor Condition
 3 = Poor condition
 2 = Acceptable condition
 1 = Good condition
 0 = Very good condition

Library construction date: 1914
 Library renovation date: 1923
 Feasibility Study issues: None

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

The library, built in 1914, must be seismically strengthened to provide a safe facility for the community. Additionally, the existing facility is not constructed to meet current codes for energy efficiency. Windows are single-paned, the building is not insulated, the heating system is inefficient, and there are significant issues with temperature control due to large windows on all sides of the structure. Current lighting in the main reading room is inadequately equipped with fluorescent lighting. Lighting levels in the Children's area on the lower level are also severely inadequate. The un-zoned heating system is ineffective in providing a desirable climatic control for the facility.

The current library facility cannot add additional computers or other technologies because of the limitations of the electrical system. Moreover, the current facility cannot add either a fire protection system or an emergency lighting system.

Presently, only the children's room on the lower level of the building is accessible to wheelchair users and others with mobility limitations. Other parts of the library are inaccessible to persons who cannot climb a series of steps. Additionally, there is only one, single-user public restroom in the entire building, and it is not in compliance with ADA codes. The library is always noisy due to its size and construction.

This Carnegie building is extremely limited in flexibility. Staff functions are divided into several makeshift sections of the main reading room. The space used by the Branch Manager is in a cramped and dingy work space behind the existing circulation desk and is shared with several other staff members. On the lower level, the present configuration of staff work areas in the children's room is haphazardly placed, based upon where electrical capacity exists, rather than on efficiency of customer service. There is inadequate space for staff to handle delivery, and there is minimal space to check items in and out.

R2:

This old, historically-significant Carnegie library currently used as the Richmond Branch was built in 1914 and nominated as a landmark within the San Francisco public library system. Although well maintained as a two story, 9,820 square foot structure, it does not conform to current building codes and has the lowest possible seismic rating. The physical deficiencies are numerous, including the presence of asbestos and lead paint, single pane windows that are energy inefficient and produce glare, maxed out electrical wiring and cabling and inadequate fluorescent lighting attached to high ceilings that do produce acceptable illumination for library activities. The remodel/expansion of this grand old structure should produce a stunning yet highly functional library facility

R3:

This is a remodel and expansion of a Carnegie branch library. It is unique in the San Francisco library system in that it has land available for expansion. The building has been well maintained by the City as an historic building. This building has 9,820 SF and can't meet the current building codes. It has the lowest seismic rating a building can have. The old structure is not well suited to adding more power and data. Asbestos and lead paint are in the building. The original large single pane windows are not energy efficient and also cause major glare issues. The high ceilings and shapes of the rooms make lighting difficult.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Needs and Response to Needs

Regulatory Basis: 20440

RATING

4

Community Library Needs Assessment

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	3	4
4	4	4
3	3	4

Library Plan of Service

6. How well project responds to needs of residents
7. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
8. How well types of services are documented
9. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
3	4	4
3	3	4
4	4	3

Library Building Program

10. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
11. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
12. How well spatial relationships are described
13. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

Conceptual Plans

14. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
15. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
16. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Applicant utilized a multi-faceted methodology to gather input from the community--9 key informant interviews with representatives from community organizations; 2 community meetings; 1 community meeting for design input; design workshop; 4 focus groups (parents, adults, teens, seniors). A user survey was also used and was available in English, Chinese, and Russian, in keeping with the demographics of the community (40% Asian, with Russian population being the next significant group). Have done an excellent job in providing notes, results, and analysis in various appendices and have translated those needs into proposed library services. The community analysis was excellent and it is apparent that the applicant really knows the community. The service limitations portion of the application focused primarily on the lack of space rather than on the limitations of services. The space needs assessment is very well done but rationale for specific figures (i.e. technology, etc.) was not always apparent. The proposed size of the International Languages Collection seemed small in light of the demographics of the community (40% Asian).

PLAN OF SERVICE

Four service responses were identified, and there were 5 client-centered goals identified per the PLA Strategic Directions Initiative and proposed responses address the Strategic Plan for the San Francisco Public Library (SFPL). Objectives were not measurable but some of the proposed activities were. Not all of the service indicators were client-centered. Have done an excellent job at describing how the project fits with jurisdiction-wide service and have correlated their activities to the San Francisco Public Library Strategic Plan and to the Branch Facilities Plan.

BUILDING PROGRAM

An excellent general requirements section both in terms of comprehensiveness and detail.

An excellent description of the library's spatial relationships both in narrative and graphic form.

Outstanding and extremely well detailed space descriptions that appear to be appropriately sized.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The building program requires 9,832 net assignable square footage, or 70% of the 14,046 gross square footage. The floor plans provide 9,845 net assignable square footage, or 71% of the 13,820 gross square footage. Therefore, the floor plans have met building program requirements in an exceptional manner for both the assignable and non-assignable square footage specifications.

Despite minor inconsistencies between spatial relationships of library spaces illustrated on the floor plans and the building program, the spatial relationships follow building program requirements in an exceptional manner. The inconsistencies are:

Adult International Languages Collection and Adult Magazines and Newspapers are not in sight lines from Adult Service Center. (BP 52)

Since the Adult Service Center is not in the proximity of the study rooms, the study rooms could be left unsupervised. (BP 83)

Winter Garden Public Entrance is not in sight line from Copy Center. (BP 87)

Access to the Branch Manager's Office is not from a main path of travel through the library. (BP 90)

Children's Reference, New Books, Magazines, is close, but not adjacent to Children's Service Center. (BP 124)

Children's Service Center not in line of sight from Teen area. (BP 149)

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

R2:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

They used many and varied needs assessment techniques in English, Chinese, and Russian as appropriate, with a clear effort to reach all segments of the community. There was an excellent combination of tools at the systemwide level and the Richmond-specific level. Inclusion of the overall San Francisco Public Library (SFPL) Strategic Plan is good evidence of general planning. While the local, community survey was a rather closed-ended and somewhat leading one, the Binder Research study is excellent for general branch planning and is very well augmented by the many other, local Richmond needs assessment efforts. Outstanding summary data was provided in the narrative and detail in the appendices. The community analysis was an especially good discussion, with clear analysis of potential impacts of community characteristics on branch library services, but the service needs analysis provided no ties to specific needs assessment results, though they do tie in. The stated needs are extremely general and basic and could have been defined, for the most part, without access to any community-based input; they represent simply good, basic library services and do not show much individualizing to this specific community's demographics and community meeting input. The service limitations section mostly described space limitations rather than the service limitations that the lack of space causes; the facility clearly does need to be replaced, however. The collection allocation for International languages might be just a little on the light side at 20-25% of the collection when the Asian population alone makes up 40% of the total and a fairly high percentage are indicated as not speaking English "very well." Otherwise, space allocations seem reasonable and are well-documented. The overall executive summary does not provide much information on K-12 students and their library service needs.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The only mission provided is for SFPL systemwide; it would have been better with one specifically for this branch or some ties made between the general systemwide one and the specifics of this branch. The goals are clearly user-centered rather than library-centered and address the SFPL Strategic Plan exceedingly well. The objectives are more library-centered and are rarely measurable. Almost no service indicators are outcomes-based. Taken together, however, these three elements, plus the activities and roles included, do define a project that responds excellently to the stated needs of the Richmond community. The types of services are rather broadly-stated and don't add depth to the general statements from goals, objectives, etc. (e.g. no indication of language issues in programming nor an emphasis to address special needs/interests of the highly-educated, high-income community in any way different from the services defined in the other four branch plans). The jurisdiction "fit" did not provide a lot regarding this branch's role in the overall systemwide library service picture, but there were certainly some implications of its role presented.

BUILDING PROGRAM

No mention is made in the functional description of the use of the Program Room for literacy and homework assistance efforts; such mention would help the architect in design of this multi-purpose area. Overall, however, the building program did an excellent job of implementing the provisions of the plan of service. The general requirements were exceptionally well defined and clearly incorporate known elements of the branch (e.g. site, two stories, environment, etc.). The spatial relationships were mostly excellent. They did seem to place the Teen area near the Children's area; in fact the floor plan provided in the needs assessment document appears to require passage through the Children's area to get to the Teen area, not usually a good arrangement. Separation of a staff work area from the staff lounge (on a separate floor) is also not usually a good arrangement, but that may very well be a necessity in this small branch facility. The spaces are extremely well defined and sized.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

Net-assignable space on the plans matches the building program extremely well.

Non-assignable space on the plans matches what was called for in the building program extremely well.

The conceptual plan meets the spatial relationships called for in the building program exceptionally well with a few exceptions:

It is difficult to say if the sight line between the Adult Service Center and the Adult Magazines and Newspapers and Adult International Languages Collections has been maintained since the height of the bookstacks in the Adult Circulating Collection will be too high to see over.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Children's Service Center is not adjacent to the Children's Reference, New Books and Magazines space, but it is close.

It is questionable if the sight line between the Children's Service Area and the Teen Area has been maintained because of the height of the Children's Circulating Bookstacks.

Overall, it appears the architect has done an admirable job of meeting the spatial relationships stated in the building program in what appears to be a very difficult existing condition.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

R3:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Community analysis methodology included both a broad range of methods of informing the residents of the library planning efforts and of receiving input from the residents, which resulted in strong participation from the residents of the service area. Methods included key informant interviews, community meetings, town hall meeting devoted to the branch library project, focus groups, staff representation at community meetings, meetings with staff, and written surveys that were available in three languages. Demographic information included additional elements relevant to this community. Analysis of the needs assessment findings is insightful and appropriate, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the user area residents and their library service needs. There is a very well detailed analysis of the collection growth and the requirements for re-balancing the current collection to match the current clientele. The space needs assessment cites standards used to determine the collection size and the number of readers' seats and public access PCs, and the allocation and conversion factors are appropriate.

PLAN OF SERVICE

The plan of service is responsive to the needs of the residents, closely following the findings of the needs assessment by providing enhanced collections, programming, and services to children and teens. The plan demonstrates the tie between the strategic plan for the library jurisdiction and the plan for the Richmond Branch, pointing out the unique needs of this community. Descriptions of library services are thorough and detailed, making this a working tool for those who will implement the services.

BUILDING PROGRAM

The general requirements section is thorough and should give the design team an understanding of the overall needs of the building. Spatial relationships are clearly delineated in both a diagram and in narrative form, showing the critical primary relationships. The individual space descriptions are well done, providing all necessary elements and additional clarifying information as needed for specific areas. Because this is a Carnegie library, the branch has been nominated an historical landmark, which impacts the nature of the physical changes that can occur, which in turn, may have an impact on the services and programs for the branch.

CONCEPTUAL PLANS

The net assignable SF is clearly shown in the building program and then displayed on the plan. There is a very small difference in SF. All spaces are clearly shown.

The non-assignable SF in this plan at 29-39% may appear slightly high but this is a remodel & renovation program which usually needs more flexibility. The building program calls for 30% and the plan has delivered 29%. This is appropriate for this situation.

This is a very interesting remodel of a Carnegie Library. It faces many challenges due to the age of building. While most of the technical issues would appear to be addressable, the one major issue I see is the supervision of the teen area. The building program states the need for this supervision, but the plan's execution seems to have some gaps.

P. 44 Question some line of sight on the upper floor.

P. 51 Service center not in line of sight to new book area.

P. 80 International area not in line of sight to service center.

P. 83 Study room not in proximity to service center, and who will supervise this area?

P. 87 Copy center not in line of sight of winter garden entrance.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Integration of Electronic Technologies

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING

4

Integration of Electronic Technologies

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	4	3
3	3	4
4	4	4

Rating Panel Comments

R1:

Applicant will utilize under floor access grid for cabling and electrical flexibility, which will allow for future technological advancements. Will utilize a web-based integrated library system that will provide service in English, Spanish, and Chinese. There will be a total of 19 public computers with an additional 12 laptops in the program room. Have provided specific examples of databases and will provide four express check out cubicles that will have instructions in English and Chinese. Reference services will be enhanced by having access to "Ask Now" and there will be online homework assistance through "Live Homework Help." There will also be Web sites in Chinese and also databases. There are future plans to provide electronic resources in Russian and Japanese. A wireless network is planned for public access using personal notebook computers. A wireless network for staff is being considered.

R2:

The technology planning was excellent both for near and longer-term, future purposes, with outstanding technical detail in the SFPL technology plan and general purpose narrative in the plan of service. Inclusion of the SFPL technology plan is an excellent addition. The plan of service technology section does not include potential acquisition of e-books in Russian, only Spanish and Chinese and could do a better job of tying the technological solutions defined to actual services. It also discusses specific Homework and Literacy Centers (p. 47), while no such centers are defined anywhere, only non-staffed functions to take place occasionally in the Program Room.

R3:

Technology is seen as an important part of providing library services for student research and adult information needs. Because there is significant economic diversity within the community, the library will be providing ample public use PCs for those who do not have home access to a PC and the Internet. There is some relatively minor inconsistency between the needs assessment and the service plan in citing the current and projected numbers of public access PCs that should be clarified before moving forward to ensure that the desired outcome is achieved. The technology planning section lists numerous electronic resources that will support the service library's roles. While the resources appear to provide more than adequate basic library services, they do not appear to tie directly back to the needs assessment findings for this specific service area. Other technology applications in the renovated library include express check-out on both floors in two languages, under-floor access system for cabling, catalog access in three languages, multi-language interface to the Web site, and links to Chinese and Spanish Web sites. The library has developed two electronic resources: historical photograph collection of San Francisco and a community services directory with over 1,700 listings. Technology applications under consideration for the future include wireless access and RFID.

4 = Outstanding
 3 = Very Good
 2 = Acceptable
 1 = Limitations
 0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Site

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendix 1

RATING

4

Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

N/A

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
2	2	3
3	3	4
4	4	4
3	3	3
4	4	4
3	3	3

Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
4	4	4
3	3	4
3	3	4

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

Rating Panel Comments

Drainage issues: OK

Geotechnical issues: The site is in a seismically active region with the probability of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake within 30 years. Even though dune sand underlies the topsoil, there is low probability of liquefaction. These conditions will not significantly increase the cost of developing the site for a public library.

R1:

This project describes an expansion and renovation of a neighborhood branch of the San Francisco Public Library. The current facility is a 2 story Carnegie branch which is located in the center of the block between Geary Boulevard and Clement Street on the south and north and is bordered by 9th and 10th Avenues on the east and west. Golden Gate Park runs full east/west length of the southern end of the site. The library is within walking distance of 2 elementary schools, is adjacent to a commercial district, and is surrounded by residential units. There are 43 public transit stops within 1/4 mile of the site and there are 10 municipal and undercount bus lines that have stops within the Richmond library service area while the library is open. The site is pedestrian friendly and there is a bicycle lane that borders the Presidio 2 1/2 blocks north of the library. 9 blocks east, there is another bicycle lane that runs between the Presidio and Golden Gate Park. There are 20 bicycle parking spaces. California Street (major east/west artery) is 2 blocks north of the site and Geary Boulevard (major arterial that runs east/west that's also the longest thoroughfare in the city). State Hwy 1 (Presidio Blvd.) is located 4 1/2 blocks west of the site. There are no on-site parking spaces (there is no requirement) and there are 131 parking spaces on the streets around the library. There was public input into the design of the proposed facility.

R2:

The proposed project site is not particularly central to the entire service area which includes the Presidio, but it is quite centrally located in the section of the service area that is populated with residents. The site is located between two east/west thoroughfares, Geary Blvd. (3,755 vehicles/hour during peak use) and Clement Street (1,033 vehicles/hour during peak use). While the service area is primarily residential, both of the above thoroughfares are lined with small to moderate sized businesses (restaurants, retail shops, etc.). A major north/south thoroughfare (Park Presidio Rd.) is located 4 blocks to the west of the library site.

There are 43 public transit stops within 1/4 mile of the site served by 11 bus lines!

Sidewalks run the length of every street in the immediate area and pedestrian traffic is high. The library is a close walk for students from several nearby schools. There is a mid-block foot path located on library property that will be enhanced and improved as part of the branch's renovation. Two and 1/2 blocks to the north of the Branch is a bicycle lane that borders the Presidio, and nine blocks to the east another bicycle lane runs between the Presidio and Golden Gate Park. There are 20 bicycle parking spaces available for patrons; however, they do not appear to be sheltered from inclement weather. There are also two bicycle parking spaces for staff which are "enclosed."

While there are no on-site parking spaces, this is a highly urban environment and there are 131 parking spaces within 500' of the front door(s) of the library. There are two municipal parking lots nearby with a combined 51 parking spaces.

While not on a major thoroughfare, the library is visible in the community due to the grandeur of the 1914 Carnegie building. The building is on the California Register of Historical Resources list.

There was "extensive community involvement" in determining the nature of the reexpansion and renovation of the building."

While there is nothing on the conceptual plans that shows future expansion of the building (or parking), there is discussion in the application that there is room (10,300 sq. ft.) for another addition/expansion of the building in the future.

4 = Outstanding
3 = Very Good
2 = Acceptable
1 = Limitations
0 = Serious Limitations

EVALUATION FORM

3059 - Richmond Branch Library

R3:

The SFPL Richmond Branch Library remodels and expands an existing facility set in the center of a city block. It fronts on 9th and 10th Avenues, which are side streets, and is midway between Geary Blvd (a major arterial), and Clement Ave. (a busy neighborhood shopping street). It is very central to its neighborhood. Transit is outstanding, and auto access from Geary is a snap. Although there are no on-street marked bike lanes, there are bike paths nearby.

A municipal metered lot across the street provides 24 parking spaces. There are 107 street spaces within 500'. Those will frequently be in use. A handicapped parking space is on the street in front. In the context of a built-up city that emphasizes public transit, this is good parking. 20 bike spaces are provided.

The building is prominent - even monumental, and will be noticed when looking in its direction. It is clearly visible from 9th and 10th. The little park and play area in front helps make it a local attraction. With care, it can be seen from Clement, but from busy Geary and its taller buildings not so readily.

The site is a given, without public discussion of its desirability or of alternatives. The public was involved in design. The site is almost 3X the footprint of this two-story building. Since no on-site parking is provided (or appropriate in San Francisco), the site is quite adequate. It is a regular rectangle. Again, in the context of a neighborhood branch in a built-out city, this is an extremely good site.